

### **REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended, and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-55, 60-62, and 64-76 are currently pending, with Claims 6-19, 22-40, 44-55, and 69-75 withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 61, 62, 68, and 76 are amended by the present amendment. No new matter is added.

### **Office Action Summary**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 20, 41, 42, 61-62, 64, 67, and 76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/008694 to Miyachi et al. (hereinafter “Miyachi”); Claims 3, 4, 21, 43, 60, 65, and 66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Miyachi in view of Official Notice; and Claim 68 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Miyachi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,980,225 to Funamoto et al. (hereinafter “Funamoto”).

### **Interview Summary**

First, Applicants wish to thank Examiner Rainey and Supervisory Examiner Mengistu for the courtesy of a personal interview granted to Applicants’ representative on April 14, 2010, during which the outstanding issues in the present application were discussed.

During the interview, Applicants representative explained that Miyachi does not explicitly state that the drawings (which are relied on to reject some of the claims) are drawn to scale, and thus the drawings cannot be relied on to teach particular dimensions. While Examiner Raney remained unconvinced by such analysis, he instead suggested focusing on boundaries rather than the area constrained by the boundaries, to help advance prosecution. In this regard, Applicants’ representative discussed various options with Examiner Rainey, without settling on

specific claim wording during the interview. However, the present amendment includes claim amendments made based on the discussion, emphasizing the determination of boundary conditions, rather than what is enclosed by those boundaries.

**Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 20, 41, 42, 61-62, 64, 67, and 76 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 20, 41, 42, 61-62, 64, 67, and 76 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) with respect to amended independent Claims 1, 61, and 76.

Briefly summarizing, amended Claim 1 recites a video display device modulating luminances of pixels in accordance with a video signal to display video. The video display device includes, *inter alia*, a light source configured to emit a first light emission component and a second light emission component per one vertical cycle of the video signal. The first light emission component accounts for D% of the vertical cycle of the video signal in terms of duration and S% of a light emission intensity of a pixel over the vertical cycle, while the second light emission component accounts for (100-D)% of the vertical cycle in terms of duration and (100-S)% of the light emission intensity.

The video display device also includes a driving unit configured to drive the light source based on a control input provided by a controller; and the controller configured

to determine whether  $48 < S < 62$  and to set D to be less than or equal to  $(S-48)/0.23$  but greater than zero based on the determination that  $48 < S < 62$ ,

to determine whether  $62 \leq S < 100$  and to set D to be less than S but greater than zero based on the determination that  $62 \leq S < 100$ , and to provide the control input to the driving unit indicating at least the value of D.

Thus, Claim 1 has been amended to emphasize that a controller provides driving input to a driving unit. Further, the controller is *configured to determine various boundary conditions -*

specifically *determining whether  $48 < S < 62$* , and if so, *to set D* to be less than or equal to  $(S - 48)/0.23$  but greater than zero *based on the determination that  $48 < S < 62$* . The controller is also *configured to determine* whether  $62 \leq S < 100$  and *to set D* to be less than S but greater than zero *based on the determination that  $62 \leq S < 100$* . Finally, the controller is *configured to provide the control input to the driving unit indicating at least the value of D*.

Accordingly, amended Claim 1 recites determining various conditions (as discussed during the interview) and also recites providing control input based on those determinations.

Turning now to the applied reference, Miyachi fails to teach or suggest the particular determinations of boundary conditions as recited in amended Claim 1. Indeed, the Office Action relied on Miyachi allegedly describing one particular point which (accidentally or otherwise) fell into an area bounded by the particular boundary conditions. However, the Office Action does not assert that Miyachi describes the determination of the particular boundary conditions recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably defines over Miyachi.

Independent Claims 61 and 76, while directed to alternate embodiments, have both been amended similarly to Claim 1, to recite the determination of boundary conditions. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 61 and 76 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably define over Miyachi.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 20, 41, 42, 61-62, 64, 67, and 76 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

**Rejection of Claims 3, 4, 21, 43, 60, 65, 66, and 68 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 3, 4, 21, 43, 60, 65, 66, and 68 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and submit that none of the applied secondary references teaches or suggests the determination of particular boundary conditions as recited in the amended independent claims. Thus, the secondary references fail to cure the deficiencies of Miyachi. Indeed, the Office Action does not assert otherwise. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 3, 4, 21, 43, 60, 65, 66, and 68 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above Amendment and the foregoing remarks, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact George S. Dolina, Reg. No. 63,654 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.147; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 03, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata  
Registration No.: 39,341  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicants